



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,877	02/13/2002	Luc D'Herbement	1-1-1-26	9454

7590 09/22/2004

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

EXAMINER

KIM, WESLEY LEO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,877

Applicant(s)

D'HERBEMONT ET AL.

Examiner

Wesley L Kim

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latva-aho et al in view of Wright.

Regarding claim 1, Latva-aho et al discloses a system of mobile radio telecommunications (Par.16;1-2) comprising a core network (Par.17;3-4 CN), a UTRAN network (Par.17;4), said UTRAN network comprising radio network controllers (Par.18;4), each controlling one or more coverage areas called cells in which the user equipment devices move about (It is known to a skilled artisan that a radio network controller is an element in the UTRAN responsible for controlling the base stations in the radio network where a base station is comprised of cells, in addition, it is obvious that user equipment devices move about the cells.), however he does not expressly disclose a plurality of user equipment devices where the user equipment devices are capable of working selectively in two modes of operation, a connected mode in which resources of the system are assigned to the setting up of a connection with the user equipment device and an idle mode wherein, following a temporary interruption in operation of a radio network controller of the UTRAN network and a re-initialization of this radio network controller, the UTRAN network

Art Unit: 2683

sends a piece of information to the cells controlled by the reinitialized radio network controller or by its neighboring radio network controllers, this piece of information prompting the user equipment devices that are in these cells to make their presence known to the UTRAN network, and in that said user equipment devices in connected mode are capable of processing said piece of information.

On the other hand Wright discloses a plurality of user equipment devices (Fig.2;30,40,50) where the user equipment devices are capable of working selectively in two modes of operation (Col.4,44 Normal operation and Col.8;39 Standby mode), a connected mode in which resources of the system are assigned to the setting up of a connection with the user equipment device and an idle mode (Col.4;29-44 Registration is a process of setting up a connection) wherein, following a temporary interruption in operation of a radio network controller of the UTRAN network and a re-initialization of this radio network controller (Col.2;50-55 a disaster being the temporary interruption), the UTRAN network sends a piece of information to the cells controlled by the reinitialized radio network controller or by its neighboring radio network controllers (Col.10;13-18 A transmitted registration index to a terminal), this piece of information prompting the user equipment devices that are in these cells to make their presence known to the UTRAN network (Col.10;13-18), and in that said user equipment devices in connected mode are capable of processing said piece of information (Col.4;54-55). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to combine teachings of Latvo-aho et al and Wright in order to create an invention as disclosed in claim 1 so that a user may re-register with said

Art Unit: 2683

communication network in response to a message (Col.2;25-37 Wright) allowing the user to make its presence known to the network after temporary interruption.

3. Claim 2 and 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latva-aho et al and Wright in further view of McDonald et al.

Regarding claim 2, Latva-aho et al and Wright discloses all the limitations as recited in claim 1, however they do not expressly disclose a broadcast channel where information is transmitted. On the other hand, McDonald et al does disclose a broadcasting channel for transmitting information (Col.2;28 and Col.2;63-66). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to use a broadcasting channel for transmitting information from a network to communication units because a single transmission may target numerous receiving communication units, sometimes thousands (Col.1;53-55 McDonald et al).

Regarding claim 3, combination discussed above discloses all the limitations as recited in claim 2, however they do not disclose transmitted information being a modified value, $T_{sub.new}$, of the periodic cell update or the periodic URA update timer broadcast by the broadcast channel. McDonald et al does disclose a modified value (Col.2;62 first time is the modified value of $T_{sub.new}$), $T_{sub.new}$, of the periodic cell update or the periodic URA update timer broadcast by the broadcast channel (Col.2;61-63). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to transmit a modified value, $T_{sub.new}$, of the new periodic cell update or the periodic URA update timer broadcast by the broadcast channel because this would allow the flow of registration attempts by a community of terminals to be smoothed from a situation

Art Unit: 2683

wherein essentially the entire community of terminals is contending to register after a disaster (Col.2;62-65 McDonald et al).

Regarding claim 5, Wright discloses the transmission of a flag indicating that one of the radio network controllers of the UTRAN network has been reinitialized (Col.2 50-55 the flag indicates when the system is recovering, therefore to a skilled artisan it would be obvious to take this idea and have it so a flag is set when the system is fully recovered), however he does not disclose a maximum time value $t_{sub,max}$ assigned to the user equipment devices to make their presence known to the UTRAN network. McDonald et al does disclose a first random registration time which is in essence a maximum time value $t_{sub,max}$ assigned to the user equipment devices to make their presence known to the UTRAN (Col.2;40-42). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to combine a flag indicating that one of the radio network controllers of the UTRAN network has been reinitialized with the assigning of a maximum time value to the user equipment so that the mobile terminal refrains from attempting to register with the central system while still in recovery (Col.2;50-55) and once it knows it can register it will know to register within a maximum time value.

Regarding claim 4 and 6, combination discussed above discloses all the limitations as recited in claim 3 and 5, however they do not expressly disclose the user equipment device making its presence known to the UTRAN network at the end of a random period of time $t_{sub,update}$ smaller than $T_{sub,new}$. McDonald et al does disclose each user equipment device making its presence known to the

UTRAN network (Col.2;27-34) at the end of a random period of time (Col.2;42-43) $t_{sub.update}$ (Col.2;41 first random registration time) smaller than $T_{sub.new}$ (Col.2;40 first time). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to create a user equipment device making its presence known to the UTRAN network at the end of a random period of time $t_{sub.update}$ smaller than $T_{sub.new}$ because this would allow the flow of registration attempts by a community of terminals to be smoothed from a situation wherein essentially the entire community of terminals is contending to register after a disaster (Col.2;62-65 McDonald et al).

Regarding claim 7, Latva-aho et al discloses the identity RNC-ID of the radio network controller (Par.44;11-12) and that only the user equipment devices for which the UTRAN radio network temporary identity contains the identity RNC-ID make their presence known to the UTRAN network (Par.44;9-12 and Par.45;1-8. Once the RNC and CN set up a functional connection containing all the necessary resources including the RNC-ID, then the AP or base station starts offering service to the UE which obviously indicates that the UTRAN network is aware of its presence and it is also obvious that the UE contains this RNC-ID in order to communicate through the correct AP and RNC to let its presence be known to the network), however he does not expressly disclose a flag through which the RNC-ID is transmitted nor does he disclose the RNC being reinitialized. Wright does however disclose a flag, which discloses whether or not the RNC is in the process of reinitializing (Col.2;50-55). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to incorporate the use of a flag to transmit information, this information being an identity RNC-ID and re-initialization

Art Unit: 2683


status of the RNC, to the UE because the flag will inform the UE as to when it may register with the network to make its presence known and with which RNC to communicate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesley L Kim whose telephone number is 703-605-4319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WLK


WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600